

**BATHAE DUNNE LLP**  
Yavar Bathae (CA 282388)  
yavar@bathaeedunne.com  
Andrew C. Wolinsky (CA 345965)  
awolinsky@bathaeedunne.com  
445 Park Avenue, 9th Floor  
New York, NY 10022  
Tel.: (332) 322-8835

Brian J. Dunne (CA 275689)  
bdunne@bathaeedunne.com  
Edward M. Grauman (*pro hac vice*)  
egrauman@bathaeedunne.com  
901 South MoPac Expressway  
Barton Oaks Plaza I, Suite 300  
Austin, TX 78746  
Tel.: (213) 462-2772

*Interim Co-Lead Counsel for the  
Advertiser Class*

**SCOTT+SCOTT ATTORNEYS AT LAW LLP**  
Amanda F. Lawrence (*pro hac vice*)  
alawrence@scott-scott.com  
Patrick J. McGahan (*pro hac vice*)  
pmcgahan@scott-scott.com  
Michael P. Srodoski (*pro hac vice*)  
msrodoski@scott-scott.com  
156 South Main Street, P.O. Box 192  
Colchester, CT 06415  
Tel.: (860) 537-5537

Patrick J. Coughlin (CA 111070)  
pcoughlin@scott-scott.com  
Carmen A. Medici (CA 248417)  
cmedici@scott-scott.com  
Hal D. Cunningham (CA 243048)  
hcunningham@scott-scott.com  
Daniel J. Brockwell (CA 335983)  
dbrockwell@scott-scott.com  
600 W. Broadway, Suite 3300  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel.: (619) 233-4565

[Additional counsel on signature page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MAXIMILIAN KLEIN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-08570-JD

Hon. James Donato

**ADVERTISER PLAINTIFFS'  
OPPOSITION TO THE OMNIBUS  
MOTION TO SEAL MATERIALS  
SUBMITTED IN CONNECTION WITH  
CLASS CERTIFICATION AND *DAUBERT*  
BRIEFING AND MERITS EXPERT  
PROFFERS IN THE ADVERTISER CASE**

**FILED UNDER SEAL****INTRODUCTION**

Meta’s proposal to seal large portions of Advertiser Plaintiffs’ class certification briefing and exhibits bears no meaningful relation to the applicable standard, ignores an express admonition by the Court just four months ago, Hr’g (CMC) Tr. 13:3-17, Apr. 18, 2024, and at bottom seeks to hide from the public objectively terrible—indeed, likely criminal—conduct by Meta as it sought to maintain its social advertising monopoly power. A simple review of the evidence Meta seeks to shield from the public in connection with Advertisers’ case shows it is several years old, is in many cases publicly available, and relates to issues the public has both an interest in and a right to know about. Meta’s motion to seal regarding the Advertiser case, Dkt. 830, should be denied.

**ARGUMENT**

As explained in the accompanying Declaration of Brian J. Dunne, every sealing request by Meta, except for one category that Advertisers take no position on—the actual @fb.com email addresses of Meta employees—does not meet the applicable sealing standard, which for Meta’s sealing motion is the “compelling reasons” test, described by the Ninth Circuit as a “stringent standard” in which “a court may seal records only when it finds a compelling reason and articulates the factual basis for this ruling, without relying on hypothesis or conjecture.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-97 (9th Cir. 2016) (cleaned up).<sup>1</sup>

First, **every** piece of evidence that Meta now seeks to seal, in late 2024, is several years old, from a class period ending in December 2020. *See* Dunne Decl. ¶ 3 Rows 1-174. Most of the

<sup>1</sup> Although this Court has previously applied the “good cause” standard to class certification and *Daubert* sealing requests, Advertisers respectfully submit that Ninth Circuit precedent requires the stricter “compelling reasons” standard here. While the Ninth Circuit has sometimes said that the “compelling reasons” standard applies to “dispositive” motions, in *Center for Auto Safety* the court clarified that “public access to filed motions and their attachments does not merely depend on whether the motion is technically ‘dispositive.’ Rather, public access will turn on whether the motion is *more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.*” 809 F.3d 1092 at 1101 (emphasis added).

A class certification motion requires a “rigorous analysis” that “frequently will entail some overlap with the merits of the plaintiff’s underlying claim.” *DZ Rsr. v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, 96 F.4th 1223, 1232 (9th Cir. 2024) (cleaned up). Accordingly, “most district courts to consider the question have found that motions for class certification are ‘more than tangentially related to the underlying cause of action’ and therefore apply the ‘compelling reasons’ standard.” *Hadley v. Kellogg Sales Co.*, 2018 WL 7814785, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2018); *see also Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1101 n.8 (noting that a motion “to permit maintenance of a class action” is considered “dispositive” in the context of magistrate jurisdiction). Likewise, *Daubert* motions—and by analogy, expert proffers—are subject to the “compelling reasons” standard because “the expert’s opinion is more than tangentially related to the underlying cause of action.” *Hadley*, 2018 WL 7814785, at \*2.

**FILED UNDER SEAL**

1 information, including every word about Meta’s so-called In-App Action Panel (IAAP) program to  
 2 wiretap Snapchat and other potential competitive threats, is more than ***five years old***. (The IAAP  
 3 program ran from late 2016 to early 2019.) Similarly, evidence concerning Meta’s private API  
 4 agreements with companies like Apple and Ticketmaster is from 2019 or earlier; evidence relating to  
 5 Meta’s “Jedi Blue” agreement with Google dates from 2017 through late 2018, when a contract was  
 6 executed; and evidence concerning Meta’s agreement with Netflix and the gerrymandering of  
 7 Facebook Watch comes from 2017, 2018, and 2019. Ad pricing and revenue information are for the  
 8 Class Period—definitionally beginning seven years ago and ending in late 2020.

9       Such stale information—whose current vitality Meta does not specifically explain—is not  
 10 sealable, particularly as all of it is squarely material to Advertisers’ antitrust claims. *See, e.g., Williams*  
 11 *v. Apple, Inc.*, 2021 WL 2476916, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 17, 2021) (“[Apple] does not explain why  
 12 statistics from 2018 or before would harm Apple’s competitive standing today [in 2021].”); *Ramirez*  
 13 *v. Trans Union, LLC*, 2017 WL 1549330, at \*6 (N.D. Cal. May 1, 2017) (“As Trans Union has not  
 14 explained how this six-year old information contains confidential, proprietary information which  
 15 would competitively harm Trans Union if disclosed, the request for sealing is denied.”); *Pac. Marine*  
 16 *Propellers, Inc. v. Wartsila Def., Inc.*, 2018 WL 6601671, at \*2 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 14, 2018) (“[T]he  
 17 financial information . . . is several years old. Defendants have not shown why this outdated  
 18 information would have any effect on WDI’s competitive standing at the present.”).

19       Second, large swathes of information in Meta’s sealing submission—thirty-four out of the 174  
 20 items that Meta seeks to seal in connection with Advertisers’ case—is ***demonstrably public***, as  
 21 identified in publicly available hyperlinks identified in Advertisers’ Dunne Declaration. Such  
 22 information is not sealable. *See TML Recovery, LLC v. Cigna Corp.*, 2024 WL 1699349, at \*4 (C.D.  
 23 Cal. Feb. 2, 2024) (declining to seal “portions of a deposition transcript describing . . . something  
 24 Cigna states on its website”); *Apple Inc. v. Psystar Corp.*, 2012 WL 10852, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3,  
 25 2012) (denying motion to seal information that was publicly available, but not released by Apple);  
 26 *Williams*, 2021 WL 2476916, at \*3-\*4, \*6 (denying sealing requests covering information “reported  
 27 in the press” and/or that had been “publicly admitted” by Apple).

**FILED UNDER SEAL**

1 Third, Meta seeks to seal information from and about several squarely relevant contracts,  
 2 including Meta’s Private API agreements with companies it deemed potentially competitive such as  
 3 Apple and Ticketmaster. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 830-09 at 8 (seeking to seal statements from “Services  
 4 Integration Agreement” restricting Apple from [REDACTED]  
 5 [REDACTED]  
 6 [REDACTED]. Beyond age issues, where information is “relevant and critical” to the  
 7 court’s consideration of a motion, it cannot be sealed, even if it is part of a contract. *TML Recovery,*  
 8 *LLC*, 2024 WL 1699349, at \*4. Moreover, Meta’s (and select third parties’) submissions as to why  
 9 years-old contracts remain competitively sensitive are decidedly non-specific and vague about why  
 10 unsealing relevant portions would impact Meta or its counterparties today. *See, e.g., U.S. Ethernet*  
 11 *Innovations, LLC v. Acer, Inc.*, 2013 WL 4426507, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 14, 2013); *FibroGen, Inc.*  
 12 *v. Hangzhou Andao Pharm. Ltd.*, 2023 WL 6237986, at \*3-\*4 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 22, 2023).

13 Finally, of particular concern, Meta seeks to keep from public knowledge details of an  
 14 anticompetitive wiretapping program—IAAP—that is several years old, appears to have involved  
 15 multiple computer crimes, and has drawn press and public interest when partially disclosed.<sup>2</sup>  
 16 Specifically, in proposed redactions identified at Rows 1-3, 18-22, 25, 27-28, and 171-73 of  
 17 Advertisers’ Dunne Declaration, Meta seeks to shield from public view details of the company’s  
 18 program to intercept and decrypt secure analytics traffic from Snapchat and other potential  
 19 competitive threats between late 2017 and early 2019. As set forth below, the information Meta seeks  
 20 to redact is not only years old, but relates to a discontinued program—and Meta specifically identifies  
 21 for redaction, among other things, [REDACTED]  
 22 [REDACTED].

23  
 24 <sup>2</sup> *See, e.g., Mark Zuckerberg told Meta executives to ‘figure out’ how to crack encrypted Snapchat*  
 25 *data: court docs*, NEW YORK POST (Mar. 28, 2024), <https://bit.ly/3WULJr3>; *Facebook’s top secret*  
 26 *‘Project Ghostbusters’ spied on Snapchat, documents reveal*, THE INDEPENDENT (Mar. 27, 2024),  
 27 <https://bit.ly/46TpyWE>; *Facebook snooped on users’ Snapchat traffic in secret project, documents*  
 28 *reveal*, TECHCRUNCH (Mar. 26, 2024), <https://bit.ly/4dMmo9q>; *Mark Zuckerberg told Facebook*  
*execs to ‘figure out’ how to track encrypted usage on rival apps like Snap and YouTube, unsealed*  
*documents show*, BUSINESS INSIDER, <https://bit.ly/3YWsqQl>; *Facebook secretly looked at Snapchat,*  
*Amazon, and YouTube user data, documents reveal – “Project Ghostbusters” lies at the core of it*  
*all*, MASHABLE (Mar. 27, 2024), <https://bit.ly/4dtL3zE>.

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 At the outset, Advertisers agree with Meta’s declarant that as a general matter, “nonpublic and  
2 confidential research regarding app performance data” is competitively sensitive information, which  
3 if revealed to a competitor “could influence the competitive decision-making and business strategies  
4 employed by Meta’s competitors . . . .” Dkt. 830-1 at 83 (and many other places); *see also* Dkt. 830  
5 at 4:23-5:2. This is, of course, why it was an antitrust problem for Meta, a monopolist, to steal such  
6 information from actual and potential competitors, including Snap, through an illegal wiretapping  
7 program several years ago. To be clear, it is details of *that program*—old, discontinued, and of great  
8 public interest—that Meta now asserts should be sealed from view.

9 By way of specific examples, Meta seeks to seal portions of PX 2256, an “IAAP Technical  
10 Analysis” document used at the deposition of Mark Zuckerberg, that identify specific analytics  
11 information intercepted and decrypted from social advertising rival Snapchat. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 830-10  
12 at PALM-012863801 (under “what [decrypted Snapchat] information is being sent to servers for  
13 analysis?”: [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]. Meta further seeks to seal portions of PX 414—a  
15 July 2016 discussion amongst Onavo team members, Meta executives, and now-Meta COO Javier  
16 Olivan regarding the launch of the IAAP program—in which [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED]  
18 [REDACTED]  
19 [REDACTED].  
20 Meta seeks to seal nearly the entirety of a [REDACTED]  
21 [REDACTED]  
22 [REDACTED]  
23 [REDACTED]  
24 [REDACTED]  
25 [REDACTED]  
26 [REDACTED]  
27 [REDACTED]  
28 [REDACTED].

**FILED UNDER SEAL**

1 And finally, Meta seeks to seal portions of Advertiser’s class certification motion itself that  
2 discuss [REDACTED]  
3 [REDACTED]  
4 [REDACTED], would have been  
5 a serious computer crime.<sup>3</sup>

6 None of this information—or anything else in Rows 1-3, 18-22, 25, 27-28, or 171-73 of the  
7 Dunne Declaration—meets the sealing standard. First, the information is indisputably old: it comes  
8 from documents dated June 2016 through early 2019, and pertains to a program that Meta states was  
9 discontinued in early 2019. Further, Meta’s IAAP program is no longer in use, and Meta’s declarants  
10 do not contend that the company plans to restart intercepting and decrypting competitors’ encrypted  
11 app analytics in the future. The crimes of Meta’s past are not trade secrets going forward. *See, e.g.,*  
12 *Ramirez*, 2017 WL 1549330, at \*4 (denying sealing of information about a particular product where  
13 “Trans Union by its own admission no longer uses [the] product”). As to Dkt. 795-07, [REDACTED]  
14 [REDACTED] which Meta seeks to seal in its near-entirety, an exhibit like  
15 this one—which establishes important information about a material issue in the case and is presented  
16 for that purpose—is not subject to sealing for employee privacy concerns (to the extent those are even  
17 cognizable as a compelling interest). *See Stout v. Hartford Life and Accident Ins. Co.*, 2012 WL  
18 6025770, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 4, 2012).

**CONCLUSION**

19  
20 The Court should deny Meta’s Omnibus Motion to Seal Materials Submitted in Connection  
21 with Class Certification and *Daubert* Briefing and Merits Expert Proffers in the Advertiser Case, Dkt.  
22 830, as more specifically detailed, item-by-item, in the Dunne Declaration.

23  
24  
25 <sup>3</sup> Meta’s sealing submission identifies, but does not seek to redact, the source document for this  
26 discussion in Advertisers’ motion. *See* Dkt. 795-08 at PALM-0087584356 [REDACTED]  
27 [REDACTED] Dkt. 830-15 (same document in  
28 Meta’s sealing motion, with no proposed redactions). To the extent that Meta does not seek to seal  
this exhibit, the portions of Advertisers’ motion discussing and citing it should not be inconsistently  
sealed. To the extent that Meta’s non-redaction proposal for Dkt. 795-08 was an error or oversight,  
Advertisers oppose sealing any portion of this document.



**FILED UNDER SEAL**

1 Dated: August 19, 2024

2 **SCOTT+SCOTT**  
 3 **ATTORNEYS AT LAW LLP**

4 Amanda F. Lawrence (*pro hac vice*)  
 5 alawrence@scott-scott.com  
 6 Patrick J. McGahan (*pro hac vice*)  
 7 pmcgahan@scott-scott.com  
 8 Michael P. Srodoski (*pro hac vice*)  
 9 msrodoski@scott-scott.com  
 10 156 South Main Street, P.O. Box 192  
 11 Colchester, CT 06415  
 12 Tel.: (860) 537-5537

13 Patrick J. Coughlin (CA 111070)  
 14 pcoughlin@scott-scott.com  
 15 Carmen A. Medici (CA 248417)  
 16 cmedici@scott-scott.com  
 17 Hal D. Cunningham (CA 243048)  
 18 hcunningham@scott-scott.com  
 19 Daniel J. Brockwell (CA 335983)  
 20 dbrockwell@scott-scott.com  
 21 600 W. Broadway, Suite 3300  
 22 San Diego, CA 92101  
 23 Tel.: (619) 233-4565

24 Patrick J. Rodriguez (*pro hac vice*)  
 25 prodriguez@scott-scott.com  
 26 230 Park Avenue, 17th Floor  
 27 New York, NY 10169  
 28 Tel.: (212) 223-6444

*Interim Co-Lead Counsel for the Advertiser Classes*

19 **LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN LLP**

20 Keith J. Verrier (*pro hac vice*)  
 21 kverrier@lfsblaw.com  
 22 Austin B. Cohen (*pro hac vice*)  
 23 acohen@lfsblaw.com  
 24 510 Walnut Street, Suite 500  
 25 Philadelphia, PA 19106-3997  
 26 Tel.: (215) 592-1500

27 *Members of Executive Committee for the Advertiser*  
 28 *Classes*

**BATHAE DUNNE LLP**

By: /s/ Brian J. Dunne  
 Yavar Bathaee (CA 282388)  
 yavar@bathaeedunne.com  
 Andrew C. Wolinsky (CA 345965)  
 awolinsky@bathaeedunne.com  
 Andrew M. Williamson (CA 344695)  
 awilliamson@bathaeedunne.com  
 445 Park Avenue, 9th Floor  
 New York, NY 10022  
 Tel.: (332) 322-8835

Brian J. Dunne (CA 275689)  
 bdunne@bathaeedunne.com  
 Edward M. Grauman (*pro hac vice*)  
 egrauman@bathaeedunne.com  
 Priscilla Ghiță (*pro hac vice*)  
 901 South MoPac Expressway  
 Barton Oaks Plaza I, Suite 300  
 Austin, TX 78746  
 Tel.: (213) 462-2772

Allison Watson (CA 328596)  
 awatson@bathaeedunne.com  
 3420 Bristol St, Ste 600  
 Costa Mesa, CA 92626-7133

**AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC**

Tina Wolfson (CA 174806)  
 twolfson@ahdootwolfson.com  
 Robert Ahdoot (CA 172098)  
 rahdoot@ahdootwolfson.com  
 Theodore W. Maya (CA 223242)  
 tmaya@ahdootwolfson.com  
 Henry J. Kelson (*pro hac vice*)  
 hkelston@ahdootwolfson.com  
 2600 West Olive Avenue, Suite 500  
 Burbank, CA 91505  
 Tel.: (310) 474-9111